

IFW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Reply to Non-Final Office Action , in response to the Office Action mailed on April 7, 2010		
Application No. 10/587,890	Filing Date 07/31/2006	Applicant(s) LIN ET AL.
Examiner SUNIL CHACKO	Art Unit 2625	
For: INTERNET PRINTING		

Commissioner For Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:


Applicant requests that the following arguments of the patent application be entered in response to the office action mailed on April 7, 2010.

Arguments


Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

After studying the inventions of Lodwick and Qiao cited by the Examiner, we find that some special design in our invention is not obvious in their inventions. Hence Applicant requests the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of claims.


Let us draw Diagrams to show the designs of Lodwick, Qiao and ours, and compare them.



Diag 1 - Lodwick



Diag 2 - Qiao



Diag 3 - Claim 6